

1 RALPH W. ROBINSON (State Bar No. 51346)  
FRANCIS J. TORRENCE (State Bar No. 154653)  
2 **WILSON, ELSE, MOSKOWITZ,**  
**EDELMAN & DICKER LLP**  
3 525 Market Street, 17th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94105-2725  
4 Telephone: (415) 433-0990  
Facsimile: (415) 434-1370  
5 E-mail: ralph.robinson@wilsonelser.com  
E-mail: francis.torrence@wilsonelser.com

6  
7 JURA C. ZIBAS (State Bar No. 217864)  
**WILSON, ELSE, MOSKOWITZ,**  
**EDELMAN & DICKER LLP**  
8 150 E. 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10017  
9 Telephone: (212) 490-3000  
Facsimile: (212) 490-3038  
10 E-mail: jura.zibas@wilsonelser.com

11 Attorneys for Defendants  
**INSTACARE CORP. and**  
12 **PHARMATECH SOLUTIONS, INC.**

13 LAEL E. ANDARA (State Bar No. 215416)  
ROBERT P. ANDRIS (State Bar No. 130290)  
14 **ROPERS, MAJESKI, KOHN & BENTLEY**  
1001 Marshall Street, Suite 500  
15 Redwood City, California 94063-2052  
Telephone: (650) 364-8200  
16 Facsimile: (650) 780-1701  
Email: randris@rmkb.com  
17 Email: landara@rmkb.com

18 Attorneys for Defendants  
**SHASTA TECHNOLOGIES, LLC and CONDUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.**

20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

21 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SAN JOSE DIVISION**

22 LIFESCAN SCOTLAND, LTD.,

23 Plaintiff,

24 v.

25 SHASTA TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,  
INSTACARE CORP., PHARMATECH  
26 SOLUTIONS, INC., and CONDUCTIVE  
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

27 Defendants.  
28

**Case No. CV11-04494-EJD (PSG)**

**DEFENDANTS' SUPPLEMENTAL CASE  
MANAGEMENT STATEMENT**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f)  
Civ. L. R. 16-9  
Patent L.R. 2-1

**Judge:** Honorable Edward J. Davila  
**Courtroom:** 1  
**Date:** January 20, 2012  
**Time:** 10:00 a.m.

Pursuant to the Court's Order of January 11, 2012, Defendants Shasta Technologies, LLC ("Shasta"), Instacare Corp. ("Instacare"), Pharmatech Solutions, Inc. ("Pharmatech") and Conductive Technologies, Inc. ("Conductive") (collectively, "Defendants") submit this Supplemental Case Management Statement.

#### **Section 17: Discovery and Pre-trial Scheduling:**

As set forth in the parties' Joint CMC Statement, Defendants request that all discovery be stayed until such time as the Court rules on Defendants' pending motions, presently set for March 23, 2012. Specifically, Defendants propose that the discovery Stay apply to any new discovery and all first party discovery.<sup>1</sup> Consistent with this approach, Defendants propose that a further CMC can be held after the Court's ruling on the motions, if necessary, at which time the parties can address an appropriate discovery plan and schedule. The Defendants request this because at present there is no "final" product on the market and the anticipated product is still in the application process before the FDA. As such, any efforts at discovery at present will constantly be forced to deal with the fact that there is no final product at issue.

Alternatively, Defendants have proposed that the entire case be stayed until such time as the FDA approves the test strips, at which time the parties can schedule a further CMC with the Court.

Now, as yet another alternative approach, and pursuant to the Court's January 11, 2012 Order, the Defendants propose the following schedule. Defendants do so only as an alternative to their request for a stay of discovery and this litigation until the Court rules on the Defendants' pending motions.

The proposed schedule addresses the future handling of the case up through the Claim Construction Hearing (proposed for January 2013), at which point the Defendants propose a Further Case Management Conference to address the final deadlines and schedules for the litigation.

<sup>1</sup> To the extent third party subpoenas have been served, it seems most efficient to have those should go forward at this time.

Please note, the following proposed schedule adopts plaintiff's proposed date of January 27, 2012 for its Patent Local Rules 3-1 and 3-2 disclosures.

Event	Proposed Date
Initial Case Management Conference	January 20, 2012
LifeScan Scotland's disclosure of asserted claims and infringement contentions (Patent L.R. 3-1) and related document production (Patent L.R. 3-2).	January 27, 2012
Rule 26(a)(1)(A) initial disclosures	February 24, 2012, or later if modified at the CMC.
Hearing on Defendants' Motions	March 23, 2012
Defendants' invalidity contentions (Patent L.R. 3-3) and related document production (Patent L.R. 3-4)	April 20, 2012 (all further dates might require modification following the March 23 hearing.)
Exchange of proposed terms and claim elements for construction (Patent L.R. 4-1(a))	May 16, 2012
Exchange of preliminary proposed claim construction and extrinsic evidence (Patent L.R. 4-2) and initial disclosure of claim construction expert identities and résumés	August 6, 2012
Joint claim construction statement (Patent L.R. 4-3) – limited to 10 terms unless leave of court granted.	September 18, 2012
Completion of Claim Construction Discovery Other Than Expert Depositions (Patent L.R. 4-4)	October 19, 2012
LifeScan Scotland's opening claim construction brief (Patent L.R. 4-5(a)) and any expert declaration in support	November 5, 2012
Defendants' opposing claim construction Brief, (Patent L.R. 4-5(b)) and any expert declaration in support	December 3, 2012
LifeScan Scotland's reply claim construction brief (Patent L.R. 4-5(c)).	December 24, 2012
Technology Tutorial	January 11, 2013 or other such day that is convenient for the Court
Claim Construction Hearing	January 11, 2013 or other such day that is convenient for the Court
Further Case Management Conference for setting remaining trial and pretrial dates.	February 15, 2013, or at the Court's convenience.

#### **Limitations on Discovery:**

As set forth in their section in the Joint CMC Statement, Defendants oppose plaintiff's requests to expand the presumptive discovery limitations per the Federal Rules and of this Court.

Specifically, Defendants can see no reason why such a large number of hours of deposition testimony should be requested by plaintiff or even considered. Likewise, there is no reason at this point in time to modify the limits on depositions as set forth in Rule 30. Plaintiff has provided no explanation or reason for modifying those limitations. Defendants do not agree at this time to plaintiff's proposed discovery modifications.

Dated: January 13, 2012

WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ,  
EDELMAN & DICKER LLP

By: /s/ Francis J. Torrence  
RALPH W. ROBINSON  
FRANCIS J. TORRENCE  
Attorneys for Defendants  
INSTACARE CORP.,  
PHARMATECH SOLUTIONS, INC.

JURA C. ZIBAS  
150 E. 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10017  
Telephone: (212) 490-3000  
Facsimile: (212) 490-3038  
E-mail: jura.zibas@wilsonelser.com

Dated: January 13, 2012

ROPERS, MAJESKI, KOHN & BENTLEY

By: /s/ Robert P. Andris  
ROBERT P. ANDRIS  
LAEL E. ANDARA  
Attorneys for Defendants  
SHASTA TECHNOLOGIES, LLC and  
CONDUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

I hereby attest that I have on file written permission to sign this stipulation from all parties whose signatures are indicated by a "conformed" signature (/s/) within this e-filed document.

/s/ Francis J. Torrence